

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are pending in the present application. Claims 4-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. The Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application directed to the subject matter contained in cancelled claims 5-20.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Sela**

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Sela (US Patent 5,931,018). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) to claims 1-3 is respectfully traversed.

In formulating the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §10102(b), the Examiner alleges that Sela discloses receiving input electronic data of an image intended to be printed (Bands 8-1 through 8-10 of Figure 1 of Sela); inspecting the electronic data to determine a lead edge blank border of the image, the lead edge blank border being a portion of the electronic data of the image corresponding to an area located at a leading edge of the recording medium onto which no marking material is to be deposited, the lead edge blank border having a first dimension parallel to a direction the recording medium is being transported and a second dimension perpendicular to a direction the recording medium is being transported (Bands 8-1, 8-2, and 8-3 of Figure 1 of Sela); determining, on a page by page basis, whether a length of the lead edge blank border (rendering cost  $T_i$  of Sela), in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance (Column 6, line 59 through column 7, line 14 of Sela); and adjusting, on a page by page basis, imaging and paper delivery timing accordingly to increase subsequent printing speed when length of the lead edge blank border (rendering cost  $T_i$  of Sela), in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance (Column 6, lines 18-21, 45-52; column 7, lines 15-21; and column 13, lines 59-62 of Sela).

Based upon these allegations, the Examiner concludes that Sela anticipates the presently claimed invention. These allegations and conclusion are respectfully traversed.

**Independent claim 1**

As set forth above, amended independent claim 1 recites a method for minimizing the Inter-Document Zone in multi-pass printing system architectures with print engines employing asynchronous paper delivery and providing control over paper feed and imaging times.

The claimed method receives input electronic data of an image intended to be printed on a recording medium; inspects the electronic data to determine a lead edge blank border of the image, the lead edge blank border being a portion of the electronic data of the image corresponding to an area located at a leading edge of the recording medium onto which no marking material is to be deposited, the lead edge blank border having a first dimension parallel to a direction the recording medium is being transported and a second dimension perpendicular to a direction the recording medium is being transported; determines, on a page by page basis, whether a length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance; and adjusts, on a page by page basis, imaging and paper delivery timing accordingly to increase subsequent printing speed when length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance.

In formulating the rejection, the Examiner apparently asserts that the illustration of three bands of no image (Bands 8-1, 8-2, and 8-3 of Figure 1 of Sela) teaches the inspecting of the electronic data to determine a lead edge blank border of the image wherein the lead edge blank border being a portion of the electronic data of the image corresponding to an area located at a leading edge of the recording medium onto which no marking material is to be deposited, the lead edge blank border having a first dimension parallel to a direction the recording medium is being transported and a second dimension perpendicular to a direction the recording medium is being transported; determines, on a page by page basis.

Contrary to the Examiner asserts, the bands, illustrated in Figure 1, are predetermined size bands of image data. Sela fails to disclose any inspecting of the electronic data to determine a lead edge blank border of the image. More specifically, Sela fails to disclose any determination which would specifically identify bands 8-1, 8-2, and 8-3 of Figure 1 as being a lead edge blank border.

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sela fails to disclose inspecting the electronic data to determine a lead edge blank border of the image wherein the lead edge blank border being a portion of the electronic data of the image corresponding to an area located at a leading edge of the recording medium onto which no marking material is to be deposited, the lead edge blank border having a first dimension parallel to a direction the recording medium is being transported and a second dimension perpendicular to a direction the recording medium is being transported; determines, on a page by page basis.

Moreover, in formulating the rejection, the Examiner apparently asserts that the determining of the rendering cost  $T_i$  of Sela and comparing it to a predetermined value is equivalent to determines, on a page by page basis, whether a length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance.

Sela teaches the rendering cost  $T_i$  is the time required process the image for a band of image data. Sela fails to disclose that the rendering cost  $T_i$  is the a length of the lead edge blank border in the first dimension because the rendering cost  $T_i$  is not dependent upon the length of the band of data in the first dimension because all the bands of image data are a predetermined size; i.e., the bands are the same size with respect to the physical dimensions the band represents on a recording medium (paper). If the bands were not the same size, the method utilized by Sela would be inoperable.

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sela fails to disclose determining, on a page by page basis, whether a length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance.

Lastly, in formulating the rejection, the Examiner asserts that Sela teaches adjusting, on a page by page basis, imaging and paper delivery timing accordingly to increase subsequent printing speed when length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance.

Sela teaches, at column 7, lines 4-14, that if the rendering cost  $T_i$  exceeds a predetermined value, the speed control circuitry causes the print engine to slow down; whereas the presently claimed invention sets forth adjusting, on a page by page basis, imaging and paper delivery timing accordingly **to increase subsequent printing speed** when length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, **exceeds** a predetermined distance.

Therefore, Sela fails to disclose adjusting, on a page by page basis, imaging and paper delivery timing accordingly to increase subsequent printing speed when length of the lead edge blank border, in the first dimension, exceeds a predetermined distance.

**Dependent claims 2 and 3**

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 3, the Applicant, for the sake of brevity, will not address the reasons supporting patentability for these individual dependent claims, as these claims depend directly from allowable independent claim 1. The Applicant reserves the right to address the patentability of these dependent claims at a later time, should it be necessary.

Accordingly, in view of remarks set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of all the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the present rejection. Also, an early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael J. Nickerson', with a stylized, cursive script.

Michael J. Nickerson  
Registration No. 33,265  
Basch & Nickerson LLP  
1777 Penfield Road  
Penfield, New York 14526  
Telephone: (585) 899-3970  
Customer No. 75931

MJN/mjn